

REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 1-7 and 11-28 are pending. Claims 11-28 have been renumbered as claims 8-25. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include the limitation that the light sheet is provided in an air space over the touch pad. The support for the amendment can be found in Figure 4.

No new matter has been introduced.

In the office action, all pending claims are rejected.

At section 3 of the office action, claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Muraoka* (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,644)

In rejecting claims 1 and 8, the Examiner states that *Muraoka* discloses a light detection system as claimed. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is respectfully submitted that *Muraoka* uses a polymer sheet as a touch panel to transmit polarized light from one side of the sheet to the opposite side. When the polymer sheet is depressed, the polarization direction of part of the transmitted light is turned by 90 degrees due to double refraction (Figure 5, col.3, lines 28-37). Using a detector with a polarized sheet at the end of the transmission path to detect the transmitted light intensity, the depression of the sheet can be detected.

Muraoka is different from the claimed invention in many aspects:

1. In *Muraoka*, light beams must be transmitted in a sheet of optical material that has an optical property of double refraction. In contrast, the light sheet in the claimed invention is provided in an air space. Air does not have the optical property of double refraction.
2. *Muraoka* does not disclose or suggest that the light intensity in the light sheet is spatially varying.

For the above reasons, claims 1 and 8 are clearly distinguishable over the cited *Muraoka* reference.

At section 6, claims 2-7, 9-16 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Muraoka*, in view of *Amitai* (WO 01/95027 which is the same as U.S. Patent No. 6,829,095).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7, 9-16 and 22-25 are dependent from claims 1 and 8 and recite features not recited in claims 1 and 8. For reasons regarding claims 1 and 8 above, claims 2-7, 9-16 and 22-25 are also distinguishable over the cited *Muraoka* and *Amitai* references.


At section 7, claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Muraoka*, in view of *Graham et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6351,260).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 17-21 are dependent from claims 1 and 8 and recite features not recited in claims 1 and 8. For reasons regarding claims 1 and 8 above, claims 17-21 are also distinguishable over the cited *Muraoka* and *Graham et al.* references.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-25 are allowable. Early allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth Q. Lao
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 40,061

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955